

Remarks

In the non-final Office Action mailed April 29, 2008 claims 1-41 are pending. Claims 12-26 have been cancelled. Claims 27-34 are allowed. Claims 1-10, and 35-41 are rejected. Claim 11 is objected to. The Applicants traverse the rejection herein.

Allowable claims

The Applicants acknowledge allowable claims 27-34 as indicated by the Examiner.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claim 11 as being dependent on a rejected base claim 1 and has indicated that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants have amended base claim 1 and submit that claim 11 is allowable in view of the cited art.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 suggesting that the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants have amended claims 35-36 and 40 and submit that claims 35-41 are directed to statutory subject matter as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 37-39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner indicated that the rejected claims are method claims depending on claims reciting a machine accessible medium. The Applicants have amended claims 36, and 40 to recite a method and submit that 37-39 and 41 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,510,896 (Wafler) and U.S. Patent No. 5,852,678 (Shiau). The Applicants submit that amended claims 1-10 and 35 are non-obvious in view of the combination of Wafler and Shiau.

The Applicants have amended claim 1 and 25 to clarify that a descreen filter is selected

based upon the halftone frequency of the printer. Amended independent claim 1, paraphrased herein, recites a method for enhancing image processing for a color reprographic system. According to the method, scanner data is generated by scanning a known target having target data on a scanner. A gray balance distortion in the scanner data is detected based on the known target data. Using the detected distortion, scanner gray balance parameters are generated when the gray balance distortion exceeds a threshold. Scanner color parameters are then generated based on the scanner data and the known target data. After a printer target is printed on a printer, the printed target is scanned by the scanner. The scanned printer target is then corrected based upon the previously generated gray balance distortion and scanner color parameters. Using the corrected scanned printer target, a halftone frequency of the printer is determined. Based on the halftone frequency of the printer, a descreen filter is selected.

In rejecting claim 1 and claim 35, the Examiner has indicated that Wafler does not disclose detecting a halftone frequency (Office Action, page 6). In alleviating this weakness in Wafler in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner has suggested that Shiau discloses that a descreening filter is selected based upon halftone frequency information (Column 5, lines 50-61). The Applicants submit that Shiau does not teach or reasonably suggest that descreening filters are chosen based upon the halftone frequency of the printer.

Shiau teaches that descreening is necessary in order to prevent moiré patterns which can result when an image already containing screen effects is screened again. In Shiau, descreen filters are selected based upon image data, not on a halftone frequency of a printer. The Applicants therefore submit that amended independent claim 1 is non-obvious over the cited art. Amended independent claim 35, which recites analogous features of claim 1, is non-obvious for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 2-10, which recited additional limitations of allowable base claims 1 and 35, are non-obvious for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-11 and 35-41 are non-obvious in view of the cited art, and respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1-11 and 35-41.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: /July 29, 2008/

/Sean J. Varley/

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)